



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,112	11/26/2003	Christopher S. Campbell	ARC920030088US1	1350

7590 05/19/2006

Frederick W. Gibb, III
McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
Suite 304
2568-A Riva Road
Annapolis, MD 21401

EXAMINER

COLAN, GIOVANNA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,112

Applicant(s)

CAMPBELL ET AL.

Examiner

Giovanna Colan

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/26/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is issued in response to applicant filed application on 11/26/2003.
2. Claims 1 – 57 are pending.
3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/26/2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2162

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1 – 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al. (Palmer hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,990,628 B1, filed: June 14, 1999) as in view of Woo (US Patent No. 7,039,641 B2, filed: February 22, 2001).

Regarding Claims 1, 20, and 39, Palmer discloses a program storage device readable by computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by said computer to perform a program storage device of extracting information, said program storage device comprising:

inputting a query (Col. 7, lines 30 – 32, Palmer);

searching a database of documents based on said query (Col. 7, lines 28 – 32, Palmer);

retrieving documents from said database matching said query using a plurality of classifiers (Col. 3, lines 1 – 3, Palmer).

Palmer discloses all the limitations as disclosed above. However, Palmer is silent with respect to a hierarchical cascade of classifier layers. On the other hand, Woo discloses classifiers arranged in a hierarchical cascade of classifier layers (Fig. 1, item 20, Col. 17, lines 44 – 49, Woo¹). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Woo' teachings to the

¹ Wherein the filters correspond to the classifiers claimed.

system of Palmer. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Woo (Col.1 and 2, lines 66 – 67 and 1 – 2; respectively, Woo), to provide a relatively efficient method and system for finding or identifying an applicable filter when a relatively large number of filters are employed in a packet classification system. In addition, both of the references (Palmer and Woo) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor of database management system, such as, searching, classifying data, weights, and frequencies. This relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

The combination of Palmer in view of Woo (“Palmer/Woo” hereinafter) further discloses classifiers (Col. 14, lines 23 – 26, categorization within the training set, Palmer; and Fig. 1, item 20, Col. 17, lines 44 – 49, Woo²) including weighted training data points (Col. 13, lines 62 – 66, Palmer³) comprising feature vectors representing any portion of a document (Col. 14, lines 31 – 35, Palmer); and weighing an output from said cascade according to a rate of success of query terms being matched by each layer of said cascade, wherein said weighing is performed using a terminal classifier (Col. 16, lines 1 – 11, Palmer⁴; and Col. 5, lines 54 – 61, Woo⁵).

Regarding Claims 2, 21, and 40, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein each classifier accepts an input distribution of data points (Col. 5, lines 41 – 45, input k-tuple t , Woo) and transforms said input distribution to an output

² Wherein the filters correspond to the classifiers claimed.

³ Wherein the training set corresponds to the weighted training data points claimed.

⁴ Wherein examiner interprets the confidence score as the rate of success claimed; and the β category as the terminal classifier claimed.

Art Unit: 2162

distribution of said data points (Fig. 8, item 72, Col. 5 and 15, lines 41 – 45 and 20 – 21, returns the first F_i and output stage; respectively, Woo).

Regarding Claims 3, 22, and 41, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein each classifier is trained by weighing training data points at each classifier layer in said cascade by an output distribution generated by each previous classifier layer (Fig. 8, item 72, Col. 5 and 15, lines 41 – 45 and 20 – 21, returns the first F_i and output stage; respectively, Woo), and wherein weights of said training data points of said first classifier layer are uniform (Col. 5, lines 54 – 57, Woo).

Regarding Claims 4, 23, and 42, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein each classifier is trained according to said query input (Col. 11, lines 46 – 48, Woo⁶).

Regarding Claims 5, 24, and 43, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said query input is based on a minimum number of example documents (Col. 13, lines 62 – 67, small set of electronic documents, Woo).

Regarding Claims 6, 25, and 44, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said document comprises data points comprising feature vectors

⁵ Wherein examiner interprets $prob(F_i \text{ is the best matching filter for } t)$ as the rate of success claimed.

⁶ Wherein examiner interprets the step of matching the filters to the input packet as the step where each classifier is trained according to the query input claimed. Wherein the input bit (further disclosed as "selection criteria" in Col. 11, lines 53 – 55, Woo) corresponds to the query input claimed.

representing any portion of said document (Col. 14, lines 31 – 35, Palmer; and Col. 14, lines 31 – 35, feature vectors, Woo).

Regarding Claims 7, 26, and 45, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said documents comprise a file format capable of being represented by said feature vectors (Col. 14, lines 31 – 35, Palmer⁷).

Regarding Claims 8, 27, and 46, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said documents comprise any of text files, images, web pages, video files, and audio files (Col. 3, lines 57 – 62, Palmer).

Regarding Claims 9, 28, and 47, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein a classifier at each layer in said hierarchical cascade is trained for each layer with an expectation maximization methodology that maximizes a likelihood of a joint distribution of said training data points and latent variables (Col. 9, lines 16 – 21, minimize duplication and maximize “balancedness”, Woo⁸).

Regarding Claims 10, 29, and 48, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein each layer of said cascade of classifiers is trained in succession from a previous layer by said expectation maximization methodology, wherein said output

⁷ Examiner interprets that if feature vectors can be constructed for each document, then it is implied that the format of these documents/or files can be represented in such feature vectors.

⁸ Wherein the distribution of input traffic corresponds to the join distribution claimed.

distribution is used as an input distribution for a succeeding layer (Fig. 8, item 68a, 70a, 68b, 70b, Col. 15, lines 15 – 19, Woo).

Regarding Claims 11, 30, and 49, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein each layer of said cascade of classifiers is trained by successive iterations of said expectation maximization methodology until a convergence of parameter values associated with said output distribution of each layer occurs in succession (Fig. 4, item 406 and 410, Col. 16, lines 51 – 55, Palmer⁹).

Regarding Claims 12, 31, and 50, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said successive iterations comprise a fixed number of iterations (Fig. 4, item 406 and 410, Col. 16, lines 51 – 55, Palmer¹⁰).

Regarding Claims 13, 32, and 51, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein all layers of said cascade of classifiers are trained by successive iterations of said expectation maximization methodology until a convergence of parameter values associated with output distributions of all layers occurs (Fig. 4, item 406 and 410, Col. 16, lines 51 – 55, Palmer¹¹), wherein during each step of the of said iterations, the output distribution of each layer is used to weigh the input distribution of a

⁹ Wherein the pre-determined maximum corresponds to convergence parameter of values claimed.

¹⁰ The iterations, that include a pre-determined number used for testing, imply a fixed number of iterations as claimed.

¹¹ Wherein the pre-determined maximum corresponds to convergence parameter of values claimed.

succeeding layer (Col. 16, lines 59 – 62, Palmer¹²; and Fig. 8, item 68a, 70a, 68b, 70b, Col. 15, lines 15 – 19, Woo).

Regarding Claims 14, 33, and 52, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said successive iterations comprise a fixed number of iterations (Fig. 4, item 406 and 410, Col. 16, lines 51 – 55, Palmer¹³).

Regarding Claims 15, 35, and 53, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein each classifier layer generates a relevancy score associated with each a data point, wherein said relevancy score comprises an indication of how closely matched said data point is to said example documents (Col. 4, lines 11 – 16, Palmer).

Regarding Claims 16, 37, and 54, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein each classifier layer generates a relevancy score associated with said document, wherein said relevancy score is calculated from relevancy scores of individual data points within said document (Col. 4, lines 14 – 16, confidence value or score characterizes the relevance of a particular document to a given query, Palmer).

Regarding Claims 17, 36, and 55, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said terminal classifier generates a relevancy score associated with

¹² Wherein the current value of $x(j, k)$ corresponds to the output distribution claimed; and the buffer $x'(k)$ corresponds to the input distribution claimed.

¹³ The iterations, that include a pre-determined number used for testing, imply a fixed number of iterations as claimed.

Art Unit: 2162

each data point, wherein said relevancy score comprises an indication of how closely matched said data point is to said example documents (Col. 4, lines 11 – 16, Palmer), and wherein said relevancy score is computed by combining relevancy scores generated by classifiers at each layer of the cascade (Col. 12, lines 22 – 28, Palmer).

Regarding Claims 18, 34, and 56, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein said terminal classifier generates a relevancy score associated with a document, wherein said relevancy score is calculated from relevancy scores of individual data points within said document (Col. 4, lines 14 – 16, Palmer).

Regarding Claims 19, 38, and 57, Palmer/Woo discloses a program storage device, wherein features of said feature vectors comprise words within a range of words located proximate to entities of interest in said document (Col. 14, lines 29 – 35, Palmer¹⁴).

Prior Art Made Of Record

1. Palmer et al. (US Patent No. 6,990,628 B1, filed: June 14, 1999) discloses a method and apparatus for measuring similarity among electronic documents.
2. Woo (US Patent No. 7,039,641 B2, filed: February 22, 2001) discloses modular packet classification.
3. Itzhak et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0181525 A1) discloses a system and method for automated mapping of keywords and key phrases to documents.
4. Swaminathan et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0267729 A1) discloses a knowledge management tool.
5. Appelt et al. (US Patent No. 6,601,026 B2) discloses an information retrieval by natural language querying.

¹⁴ Wherein examiner interprets one-half million word phrases out of two million features corresponds to the words within a range claimed.


Points Of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Giovanna Colan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2752. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Giovanna Colan
Examiner
Art Unit 2162
May 5, 2006


JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

SA